

General Plan 2020
Interest Group Committee Meeting Minutes
September 24, 2001
Revised October 8, 2001

Interest Group Committee:

Al Stehly	Farm Bureau
Bonnie Gendron	Back Country Coalition
Bruce Tabb	Environmental Development
Carolyn Chase	Coalition for Transportation Choices
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Diane Coombs	Citizen Coordinate for Century 3
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Gary Piro	Save Our Land Values
Greg Lambron	Helix Land Company
Jim Whalen	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Kevin Doyle	National Wildlife Federation
Liz Higgins	San Diego Association of Realtors
Matt Adams	Building Industry Association
Mike Stepner	SD Regional Economic Development Corporation
Phil Pryde	San Diego Audubon
Scott Aishton	American Institute of Architects
Terry Barker	American Society of Landscape Architects

Public at Large:

Allison Rolfe	SD Audubon Society
Brent McDonald	Caltrans
Charlene Ayers	
David Pallinger	Ramona
Dave Shibley	
Devore Smith	Sierra Club
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona Planning Group
Florence P. Sloane	SDCSD
Joe Klasen	Potrero
Jon Vick	Valley Center
Juliana Bugbee	Lakeside
Lynne Baker	Endangered Habitats League
Mary Allison	USDRIC
Mike Thometz	MERIT
Parke Troutman	UCSD
Rich Cantillon	Sierra Club
Roger Simpson	Sycuan Band of Kumeyaay
Scott C. Molloy	J. Whalen Associates

County Staff:

Karen Scarborough (DPLU, group facilitator)
Gary Pryor (DPLU)
Ivan Holler (DPLU)
Michelle Yip (DPLU)
Tom Harron (County Counsel)

Agenda Item II: Logistics –

- a) Minutes for August 27, 2001
 - E. Bowlby felt that the following statement he had made should have been included in the minutes: *There was no double dipping going on in terms of rezones. LeAnn had stated that environmental constraints were taken into consideration in zoning decisions which are part of our goals and policies and there should not be densities for subdivision parcelization in wetlands, floodplain areas, and steep hillsides.*
 - P. Pryde moved to approve the minutes. J. Whalen seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.
- b) Minutes for September 10, 2001
 - P. Pryde corrected a statement on page 3: *...he would prefer that this regional category not be used east of the CWA line.*
 - E. Bowlby clarified his statement on page 2: *E. Bowlby was talking about why do we have a 10 acre category rather than an 8 acre category. We currently have a designation of 8 acres and it is a semi-urban category that would contribute to sprawl.*
 - P. Pryde moved to approve the minutes. M. Stepner seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.
- c) Field Trip
 - Group felt that the recent field trip to North County was better than the first tour.
 - D. Coombs suggested that those who were not able to go on the tour, request a map of the tour route.
 - C. Chase requested a field trip to Alpine, Pine Valley, and Spring Valley. P. Pryde suggested Tecate. B. Gendron suggested Highway 94.
 - A field trip to Jamul, Tecate, Potrero, Campo, Pine Valley, and Alpine was set for October 29th at 9:00 am. Meeting locations have not been identified.
 - ❖ ***Correction made at the October 8, 2001 Interest Group Committee meeting: Spring Valley is to be added to the final list of communities that the group will be visiting.***

Agenda Item IV: Process –

- a) Status & Next Steps
 - K. Scarborough mentioned that hopefully, today, the group will be able to derive to a consensus about what changes to the structure map are to be made and would like to arrive to some consensus that the committee is still in the process and making progress in order to bring some message to the Board at the hearing on Wednesday, September 26th.
 - **Motion:** G. Piro made a motion to ask the Board for a minimal additional 90 days to continue work on this program. P. Pryde seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item III: Continued Discussion of –

- a) Structure Map
 - D. Silver proposed using the draft regional categories as a framework for discussion. He stated that we should make sure everyone gets their priorities on the table so that it can be used as a basis for the group to reach consensus.
- b) Regional Categories

- D. Silver suggested modifying the language on the regional categories and come to consensus in order to have a product for the Board hearing.
- E. Bowlby stated that he did not mind retaining the existing regional categories except in terms of the CUDA and FUDA and whether it could be re-configured.
- J. Whalen stated that he was not as “married” to new categories being part of this process as long as the existing categories do the same thing. He asked if it made sense to get an agreement here on the bigger picture to see where everything falls out. We have got a working agreement or vision that we are going to remove the units that are currently either present in a parcelized form or could be present in a subdivided form, from the backcountry, and we are also going to translate, move, or pay for those units (in some way, make an equity occur) to the “frontcountry”, being the areas along where development already is. His belief is that if the first part happens, the population issue has a way of working itself through and stated that staff needs to affirm that that would happen upon review of processing. K. Scarborough stated that J. Whalen is trying to put on the table, a potential consensus point, which identify what the group had talked about before: trying to preserve east of the CWA, take the units and move those through the mechanisms that would reside in the toolbox, which one would be TDRs and there could be others, to west of the CWA line.

Non-Agenda Item: Vision Statement –

- C. Chase stated that it was very important that it not be about the CWA line and likes the terms backcountry and frontcountry. B. Tabb stated that the CWA line has always been the dividing line.
- D. Silver thinks that using the distinction front and back is a good one. Stated that we all agree we want to keep the backcountry sparsely populated and we recognize that there is not only a question of “ghost units” or rezone value but that there is also this notion of a need to extend these equity mechanisms to existing parcels east of the CWA line through conservation easements or other instruments. He would like to use a concept of heirarchy if the group is going to discuss moving things to the “front”:
 1. There might be a first priority to shift existing “County suburbs” (i.e. Lakeside, Spring Valley, and Valle de Oro), areas in essence developed suburban, and in some cases, may be revitalized
 2. More developed village cores, (i.e. Valley Center, Alpine, and Fallbrook) places west of the CWA but have the true village core and village
 3. Core support
 4. Semi-rural estate to be undergoing intensification

He also suggested stating that there are some places west of CWA, that in essence should be treated like they were east of the CWA, in terms of our desire to preserve them as landscape units and apply equity mechanisms to them (i.e. Pauma Valley, parts of Jamul, Sweetwater River, and the Ramona grasslands). These are areas west of the CWA but in essence are very important to the region’s identity or scenery. There are some places that do not fit into any of these that are east of CWA. Green areas that are highly parcelized which can be considered as “no man’s lands”. He is not proposing those for intensification nor equity mechanisms because they may not be a priority in terms of equity mechanisms relevant to east of CWA and crucial landscape east of CWA.

- P. Pryde was confused about D. Silver’s proposal and stated that he did not know what he has in mind about a big vision. K. Scarborough replied that what we are heading towards is the delineation that D. Silver has given, which is more detail. We have the big vision that we are going to try to protect the backcountry and intensify the frontcountry through the course that we have identified. Now what we need to get to are the details on the map and identify where the is green and where it goes. D. Silver has basically identified that if you know where the green is in the backcountry and the green in the front, that becomes maintained, and then we can identify a priority system in where to move those from the back to the front. K. Scarborough also added that even though we may have a consensus on preserving the back and intensifying the front, we

need to further articulate and begin in our minds to crystalize how are we going to do that, how are we going to make a physical portrayal of the map and the definition of the regional categories.

- G. Piro stated that he was against starting on the structures because some of the basics have not been agreed on: the TDR determination, gap analysis map, and existing facilities map. He added that he did not know how everyone could make a decision on the structure without knowing what the mechanisms are that the group is going to use. He feels that the existing regional categories are a good basis and so the existing framework should be discussed, then the group should focus on what they agree on, such as clustering, TDRs, etc. (principles listed on the general trends in discussion). K. Scarborough responded that if we can all agree on protecting the backcountry, moving those parcels to the frontcountry, exactly where as identified by heirarchical priorities as presented by D. Silver, then as J. Whalen said, we can potentially click off one through eight, or potentially some of those, if we all do agree finally, with a more detailed articulation of the big vision.
- **Motion:** J. Whalen proposed the following statement: *Parties agree to cooperate on the downplanning of existing zoning in the backcountry in return for movement of development units or rights and/or conveyance of funds or credits to the "frontcountry."*
- M. Adams stated that if the group cannot put down, in a cohesive sentence, what their vision is, then they are not as advanced as they thought they were. The basic premise is that, through various tools, we are going to move lands east of the CWA to west of the CWA line with agreed to, consensus driven equity mechanisms, in place, concurrently, for the whole process. In terms of the categories, if we are having trouble ourselves, then that underscores the fundamental comment out there that perhaps we do not have to use all of these and that we should get into existing categories to expedite the process.
- E. Bowlby stated that from a regional planning perspective, he is concerned about how much growth is being planned east and west of the CWA line. Thinks the population number should be a concern because what is being said here is that we are going to just shift around the 68,000 units and they are going to remain within the unincorporated area and he does think that the infrastructure is there that can handle it. Also thinks that it is premature to be talking about TDRs as the mechanism because the group is not sure exactly what kind of program will come forward. Also feels that rezoning needs to be on the table as well because he feels that rezoning is not understood as to how it would be and not be used.
 - ❖ **Correction made at the October 8, 2001 Interest Group Committee meeting:** E. Bowlby corrected his statement to read: ... he does not think that the infrastructure is there that can handle it.
- D. Coombs stated that she could not buy into this language because it makes an assumption that she has never accepted and is not ready to accept now. It is saying that we are going to take the existing general plan and move the existing general plan population around. K. Scarborough replied that she had hoped that where this motion could take the group is, further delineating their bigger vision, as they begin to direct staff, to get that map that they want. She does not see it as an impediment but rather an addition to the group's original visions.
- **Recommendation:** D. Coombs stated that the words *in return for movement of development units or rights and/or conveyance of funds or credits*, is talking about tools without any consideration of alternative tools. Suggested identifying a range of tools to implement a map that we all agree with.
- B. Tabb stated that he agrees there are areas west of the line that need to be preserved, like Pauma Valley and the Ramona grasslands. Since the group started working with the concepts, the CWA has been the dividing line. He has a problem with the term backcountry because, for instance, Ramona, in the broad sense, is backcountry but west of the line. If there are things that need to be done in Ramona, then they need to be called out and specified. He feels that the use of back and frontcountry add ambiguity.
- **Modification:** D. Silver feels that the structure map is the vision as it implements the concepts but this vision statement is to help others that came after the map. Suggested *Parties agree to cooperate on downplanning existing zoning in the backcountry in association with equity mechanisms that protect land values and allow for voluntary conveyance of existing parcels*. Feels that the particulars of it would create too many problems, so he is suggesting substituting *equity mechanisms* for that part of *in return for*...

- J. Whalen responded to B. Tabb, stating that the ambiguity was on purpose because he agrees that there are areas west of the line that should be preserved and areas east of the line, that should be looked at for development.
- **Modification:** D. Silver suggested *...in association with equity mechanisms that protect land values and which allow for purchase of existing parcels voluntarily*. D. Coombs stated that if the group talks about existing parcels rather than existing zoning, it would be much more palatable to her.
- C. Chase stated that she believes that there has never been consensus on downzoning or that there are important areas west of the line to save. K. Scarborough explained that the motion is on the table, in order to deal with how to get the green. The concept here is that we need green and we need yellow. We need the yellow and the 10 acres for ag and green for easements. How you get the two is through the toolbox, which has yet to be identified. The statement presented, essentially says that equity mechanism language, which says we really need the green and the yellow, as well as, how we get from an existing plan to our visionary plan. We do have a map that shows a vision plan and how you get from one to the other, is through a big box of tools that we have not fully discussed or reached a consensus yet.
- **Modification:** C. Chase suggested using *tools* instead of *mechanisms* and adding *that accomplish the plan*. D. Silver modified his earlier statement to *in association with equity tools that accomplish the plan and allowance for removing existing parcels voluntarily*. B. Tabb suggested adding the other side to that statement and adding *in return for movement of development units....* D. Silver feels at this point that the group should get the map right, the general concepts, and then figure out the best of the tools. K. Scarborough reiterated that this motion states that we have agreed to preserve the backcountry with a big toolbox.
- **Alternative motion:** P. Pryde asked whether parties meant committee members and stated that language that can be understood needed to be used. He read a version of the motion that he could support: *Interest Group members agree to cooperate on rezoning [prefer rezoning because it can mean upzoning as well] of unincorporated areas, not east of the CWA line, [in addition to having proper zoning in sending areas, you need to not preemptively upzone your receiving areas] using TDRs and PDRs, as two possible implementing tools [group has always held open other possible mechanisms]*. Also stated that he feels that we have adopted a vision months ago, in reference to the guiding trends in discussion. K. Scarborough replied that the group adopted a vision prior to seeing a map and that the group needs to continue to identify to staff how to modify that map from a conceptual level to get it to detail.
- **Alternative motion:** P. Pryde had written this statement following his verbal rendering of a vision statement: *Interest Group members agree to cooperate on rezoning of unincorporated areas, subsequently utilizing TDRs and PDRs as two (possible) implementing tools*.
- **Alternative motion:** K. Doyle suggested an alternative motion: *The Interest Group agrees to cooperatively work towards achieving the preservation of rural character and wildlife habitat values of San Diego's backcountry through the pragmatic application of rezoning, downzoning/upzoning, TDRs/PDRs, and other tools that are equitable in nature, which will be identified and reached via consensus*.
- **Recommendation:** D. Silver thinks that we need to add something about *the removal of existing parcels* to that statement.
- M. Adams stated that we are attempting to minimize the economic damage that are going to be incurred by those who own that property and we are trying to do it in a way that protects some private property rights. The reason we are agreeing to that concept of TDRs and PDRs is to ensure that private property rights are protected to the best degree possible and that has to be conveyed in that motion to make everyone happy, environmental preservation and economic conservation. J. Whalen asked if anyone was against what M. Adams had stated, and if anyone was, they needed to make themselves known, otherwise the group can never reach consensus. Feels that P. Pryde captured it best with the term *rezone*.
- P. Pryde reiterated his motion saying that you do the rezoning, then you implement that through TDRs, PDRs, etc. He felt that M. Adams was saying that you do not do rezoning first, but rather you set up the system, whereby if you want to change anything you do it through TDRs. He feels that if you agreed with the former, as a matter of sequence, then the group is very close in coming together on this. M. Adams responded that the whole plan needs to be in place, ready to go, at the same time. It can be implemented with downzoning in certain areas and then, we can

wash out and work out the other components. He feels that we need to have a complete package, whereby the mechanism and methodology, in which that private landowner makes that decision of whether they want to transfer those rights, is known upfront when this plan is adopted.

- E. Bowlby stated that he is concerned that the group is overplanning the backcountry in the unincorporated areas and feels that the TDR program would present an increase in the population targets out there. He feels that with the kind of growth that we are expecting, we need to get a handle on the 1 acre through 10 acre type subdivisions, which are a glutinous land use pattern, and that this discussion feeds that land use pattern. He also added that we need to have efficiency in our infrastructure use and dollars and that means we need to steer the growth away from the unincorporated areas. He thinks that we need to get the right zoning on the land to do that and until we get the right zoning on the land, he thinks it is premature to be talking about TDRs and PDRs.
- D. Silver stated that the rezoning happens at the time of general plan amendment. There are equity mechanisms which are enacted simultaneously but the rezoning happens on day one. There may be situations where some people do not get density bonuses as they may be contingent upon payment fees or purchase credits. From the environmental side, we are acknowledging that equity mechanisms must accompany this day one rezone. The money is not going to be there on day one but we can establish the mechanisms and the source of funds because if people do not feel comfortable with that, then they are going to oppose it and the whole thing is going to crash.
- Mike stepner stated that the question of when rezoning and implementation occurs is all irrelevant and the group should not be asking that question. The question is part of the final product that we will have answers to, the implementation package, but it is not a question that we should have today and pin down answers for. He feels that the group has a motion that will move the group forward, eight principles that were adopted last May, and criteria for the regional categories that is going to design whatever comes out of this.
- **Recommendation:** J. Whalen stated that he was willing to support the term *rezoning*, knowing that that word is a loaded term because it also refers to downzoning. Suggested the addition that *we're making an effort to shift the emphasis on development*.
- **Recommendation:** D. Coombs stated that if we agree on a map, the zoning will have to be implemented to implement that map, so she does not think the group needs to discuss what and when it will take place. She likes K. Doyle's language better because it explains more. Finds one weakness in the language as it is focused on preservation of rural lands but fails to focus on the desire to change the way future growth is accommodated. It is true that we want to protect rural lands but we also want to prevent sprawl, create greenbelt buffers, concentrate on villages, and create regional open space networks, therefore it should be incorporated into the statement.
- E. Bowlby would like to get some type of information on TDRs: 1) what would it do to population targets in the unincorporated areas; 2) what would it do to the prices of the homes of where the receiving areas were; and 3) what was meant by equity mechanisms in conjunction with zoning. D. Silver responded that what he meant by that statement was that when we all go the Board of Supervisors and say we support this plan which activates rezones on day one, and currently activates equity mechanisms, the people around the table have to be convinced that they are real otherwise they are not going to go to the Board in support.
- **Recommendation:** L. Higgins stated that she cannot support P. Pryde's statement because *subsequently* does not equalize what we are trying to accomplish here, which is equities and it has to be done at the same time as TDRs and other implementing tools. Feels that the group needs to go back to J. Whalen's original motion because we are talking about downplanning in return for development units. M. Adams stated that it should say *concurrently*.
- **Recommendation:** M. Adams stated that the whole concept here is to feel free to move units out of the backcountry in exchange that we preserve property rights and land values, through a variety of mechanisms. Feels those two things need to be incorporated into any mission statement for his support. Stated that that kind of comment needs to be placed within their vision statement so that everyone knows that property rights and land values are going to be protected.
- **Recommendation:** C. Chase disagrees with the concept of dealing with land value as it may go up and down based upon the mechanism and therefore, does not belong in the language as such.

- K. Doyle asked if people are willing to acknowledge that some areas of the County need to be downzoned, regardless of anything else in this process. The group agreed. He also asked if people were willing to acknowledge that downzoning needs to occur first for a TDR program. The group disagreed. K. Scarborough responded that in order for TDR programs to work, you do have to have a land that changes its value so that you are giving them credit. All agreed that there has to be rezoning for a TDR program to work, but not necessarily for it to occur first.
- **Recommendation:** B. Tabb stated that if there is talk about one way of where it is coming off of, we need to talk of where it is going. He agrees with the preservation but also feels that there needs to be statements that growth is going to be accommodated.
- **Alternative motion:** D. Silver feels that the group needs three motions because we already have a map: 1) the sequence – rezoning and equity, and how it relates to each other; 2) there are going to be upzones and density bonuses that are going to be accommodated; and 3) existing parcels.

1st motion: *Interest Group members agree to cooperate on rezoning to achieve plan objectives (map), with concurrently activated mechanisms, that achieve landowner equity over time.*

1st motion modification: *Interest Group members agree to cooperate on rezoning to achieve the map objectives, with concurrently activated mechanisms, to maintain landowner equity.*

2nd motion: D. Silver began proposing a second motion that would address growth accommodation. K. Scarborough placed it on hold in order to obtain the first motion.

1st motion modification: *Interest Group members will cooperate to rezone areas to achieve map plan objectives, with concurrently activated mechanisms, that maintain landowner equity.*

- G. Piro stated that he could not support the word *rezone*. The County is going to work on rezoning after completing the plan. He agreed with K. Doyle and C. Chase in that there are some areas that do not have any value for redesignations.
- **Modification:** J. Whalen suggested *Interest Group members agree to cooperate on the rezoning of areas to achieve map plan objectives, with concurrently activated mechanisms, that maintain landowner equity over time.*
- E. Bowlby feels that this statement is tied to a map and does not think that we have the map at this stage.
- P. Pryde suggested that everyone take all four motions back and discuss their suggestions at the next meeting. This was not agreed upon by the group. K. Scarborough suggested reading all four at the Board hearing. This was not agreed upon by the group either.
- **Modification:** P. Pryde suggested changing the term *rezone* to *redesignate*. J. Whalen suggested to change it to *zone*.
- **Modification:** K. Scarborough suggested adding *and conservation values* at the end of *landowner equity over time*.
- **Modification:** C. Chase suggested *allow for the maintenance of landowner equity*.
- **Modification:** P. Pryde stated that you cannot maintain landowner equity in a market system any more than you can maintain stock prices. Suggested *help maintain* because it means that you may not achieve it but it will mitigate it.
- **Modification:** J. Whalen suggested *facilitate* as it shows the intention. Read at this point: *Interest Group members agree to cooperate to zone areas to achieve map plan objectives, with concurrently activated mechanisms, to facilitate maintenance of landowner equity over time and conservation values.*
- **Modification:** D. Coombs suggested *agree to cooperate to zone areas to achieve the plan, including the map, and the plan implementation program should include activating mechanisms to include the maintenance of landowner equity over time and conservation values.*
- **Modification:** K. Scarborough suggested *Interest Group members agree to cooperate to zone areas to achieve the plan, including the map, with a concurrently activated mechanism program,*

to facilitate the maintenance of landowner equity over time and conservation values. There were issues over the inclusion of the map and was deleted.

- **Modification:** C. Chase suggested ...*the plan, with a concurrently activated mechanisms to achieve conservation values and facilitate the maintenance of landowner equity over time.* The activated mechanisms are not just to facilitate the maintenance of landowner equity and the way it is written, it may suggest that the whole toolbox is for that reason.
- **Motion:** *Interest Group members agree to cooperate to zone areas to achieve the plan, with a concurrently activated mechanism program, to facilitate conservation values and the maintenance of landowner equity over time.*
- **Public comments:**
 - ⇒ D. Van Dierendonck stated that those in the backcountry understand that there are going to be certain concessions to be made and private property rights have to be addressed.
 - ⇒ D. Shibley stated that K. Scarborough should scrap the motion and use her own words that the group is making progress and wrestling with the TDR program. Reading the objective, with words like *zone* and protecting *equity* makes him think that the committee is skewed.
- K. Scarborough stated that this statement is a milestone for the committee and that this is a major point, in her opinion, for this group, and hopes that everyone can acknowledge that.
- **Vote:**
 - ⇒ Favored: 13
 - ⇒ Opposed: 5 (B. Gendron, E. Bowlby, P. Pryde, K. Doyle, D. Coombs)
 - ⇒ Abstained: 0